

NOV 01 2007

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

AMALYA MUSAYELYAN; ANNA
TADEVOSYAN,

Petitioners,

v.

PETER D. KEISLER,** Acting Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 05-73648

Agency Nos. A79-521-790
A79-521-791

MEMORANDUM*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Argued and Submitted October 19, 2007
San Francisco, California

Before: ROTH****, THOMAS, and CALLAHAN, Circuit Judges.

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** Peter D. Keisler is substituted for his predecessor, Alberto R. Gonzales, as Acting Attorney General of the United States, pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 43(c)(2).

**** The Honorable Jane Roth, Senior United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, sitting by designation.

Amalya Musayelyan and her minor daughter Anna Tadevosyan (as a derivative) seek review of a decision by the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA”) affirming the immigration judge’s (“IJ”) order of removal and denial of asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture. We deny the petition for review. Because the parties are familiar with the factual and procedural history of this case, we will not recount it here.

Because the BIA affirmed without opinion, we review the IJ's decision as the “final agency decision.” Falcon Carriche v. Ashcroft, 350 F.3d 845, 849 (9th Cir. 2003). We review the IJ’s decision under the substantial evidence standard; the IJ’s findings must be upheld unless the evidence compels a contrary result. See Tawadrus v. Ashcroft, 364 F.3d 1099, 1102 (9th Cir. 2004). We review the IJ’s adverse credibility determination under the same standard, as long as the IJ has established a legitimate articulable basis to question the applicant’s credibility and offered “specific, cogent reasons for disbelief.” Farah v. Ashcroft, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

Substantial evidence supports the IJ’s adverse credibility determination. The IJ supported her adverse credibility finding with specific reasons for disbelief, namely the inconsistencies between Ms. Musayelyan’s testimony and that of her witness. The evidence in the record does not compel a contrary finding. Likewise,

the IJ's determinations that the abuse Ms. Musayelyan suffered did not constitute past persecution, and that Ms. Musayelyan did not have an objectively reasonable fear of future persecution, are supported by substantial evidence in the record.

Substantial evidence in the record supports the conclusion that Ms. Musayelyan is not eligible for asylum, entitled to withholding of removal, or eligible for relief under the Convention Against Torture.

PETITION DENIED.